



and while she is the “prevailing party” on the nuisance claim, she was not the prevailing party on several other claims raised in the complaint. I have also considered that this case was consolidated with twelve other cases for all pretrial proceedings. I have considered that the documentary support for the application lacked specificity and accuracy in some instances. I concluded that there was little to be gained by granting Plaintiff leave to submit additional documentary support for the application, because the reduction I made to the amount of costs requested in the application was such that additional detail would not have contributed in any practical sense to the analysis or to the outcome. For all these reasons,

IT IS ORDERED:

Plaintiff’S Motion for Reconsideration and Motion for Leave (Filing No. 488) is denied.

Dated this 1<sup>st</sup> day of September, 2005.

BY THE COURT:

s/Laurie Smith Camp  
United States District Judge